## REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the office action dated November 10, 2006.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-16, 18, 19 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,287,194 (Lobiondo) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,690,210 (Onuma).

Regarding claim 1 and claims 2-10, which are dependent thereon and comprise all the elements of claim 1, this rejection fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness as the combination of Lobiondo and Onuma do not teach all the elements of these claims. Lobiondo and Onuma do not teach the element of "dividing and distributing said spool data among a plurality of printing devices with said print system component, said dividing and distributing comprising parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer drivers" as claimed in claim 1 and claims 2-10, which are dependent thereon. In this rejection, the examiner cites Onuma (Col. 1, lines 17-36; Col. 5, lines 14-47) as teaching "dividing and distributing comprising parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer drivers."

Onuma (Col. 1, lines 17-36) recites a prior art method that employs parallel processing in the host computer CPU to execute print driver functions, such as conversion of RGB to CMYK data. This method is recited by Onuma simply to establish the need for Onuma's method for controlling the speed of data flow to a printer.

The parallel processing recited in Onuma is simply multi-tasking by a processor, which can occur for many executable processes. The method is not related to printing

specifically, but to the way a microprocessor executes operations regardless of their function. This prior art method recited in Onuma differs from the dividing and distributing through parallel *playback* in these claims in several respects.

Onuma recites parallel processing of a single print job destined for a single printer. In Onuma, the job is not divided, but the processing of the driver functions are performed simultaneously through multi-tasking. Onuma discloses a distribution of processing tasks, but discloses no method for dividing a print job. Claim 1 comprises the element of dividing and distributing spool data to multiple printer drivers. This element is not taught in the combination of Onuma and Lobiondo.

Furthermore, Onuma recites processing of a print job to create spool data with a multi-tasking process. Claim 1 claims parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer drivers. The process in Onuma generates spool data with a driver executing on a multi-tasking processor, while claim 1 is directed to playback of already-created spool data.

Parallel processing with a CPU to perform data conversion is not equivalent to parallel playback of a spool file to multiple print drivers. Onuma, alone or in combination with Lobiondo, does not teach parallel playback of spool data, nor does this combination teach playback to multiple print drivers.

Further the combination of Lobiondo and Onuma is not appropriate as there is no teaching to combine these processes. Onuma is a method for controlling data transmission rates to a printer, wherein the method comprises the use of a multi-tasking processor that performs parallel processes to speed processing times. Onuma has no relation to multiple printer processes or division of print jobs into multiple print tasks.

Lobiondo teaches a form of print job distribution wherein a single print job is distributed to multiple printers. While both documents are related to printers, they do not perform related functions and contain no teaching to combine the unrelated functions.

The examiner argues that typical print processes and the functions of print drivers are well known in the art and that the print job distribution process of Lobiondo could easily be accomplished through a print driver thereby arriving at the claimed invention. However, this argument seems to be based on a combination of Lobiondo and hindsight. Lobiondo teaches a method of distributing a print task to multiple printers using a server-based system that employs a database to keep track of printer information and a scheduler to manage print jobs based on job completion deadlines. In contrast, applicant's claimed invention performs print task division and distribution with a single print system component working in conjunction with print drivers. In the applicant's claimed embodiments, no server is required. Regardless of the differences in implementation, the combination of Lobiondo and Onuma does not teach parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer drivers.

Regarding claims 11, 18, 23, 24 and claims 12-17 and 19-22, which are dependent thereon. Claims 11, 18, 23 and 24 comprise the element of "<u>and wherein said despooling further comprises parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer drivers.</u>" Accordingly, this rejection fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness for the reasons stated above in relation to claim 1, which has a similar element.

The examiner has also rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent No. 5,287,194) ("Lobiondo") and U.S. Patent

No. 6,690,210 (Onuma) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of (U.S. Patent

No. 6,049,394) ("Fukushima").

Claim 17 is dependent on claim 11, which comprises the element of "and wherein

said despooling further comprises parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer

drivers." The combination of Fukushima, Lobiondo and Onuma do not teach this

element. The examiner relies on Fukushima to teach estimating printer capability,

however, Fukushima does not teach parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer

drivers. Accordingly, this claim is patentable for the reasons stated above in relation to

claim 1.


The examiner has also rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent No. 5,287,194) ("Lobiondo") and U.S. Patent

No. 6,690,210 (Onuma) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,665,082 ("Takeoka").

Claim 20 is dependent on claim 18, which comprises the element of "and wherein

said despooling further comprises parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer

drivers." The combination of Takeoka, Lobiondo and Onuma does not teach this

element. The examiner relies on Takeoka as teaching determining printer disk storage

capacity. However, since Takeoka does not teach parallel playback of spool data to

multiple printer drivers, this claim is patentable for the reasons stated above in relation to claim 1.

The examiner has also rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent No. 5,287,194) ("Lobiondo") and U.S. Patent No. 6,690,210 (Onuma) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,632) ("Schwartz").

Claims 21 and 22 are dependent on claim 18, which comprises the element of "and wherein said despooling further comprises parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer drivers." The examiner relies on Schwartz to teach analysis of a printing device's rasterization pipeline. However, Schwartz does not teach parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer drivers. Accordingly, the combination of Schwartz, Lobiondo and Onuma do not teach this element and this claim is patentable for the reasons stated above in relation to claim 1.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,


/Scott C Krieger/
Scott C. Krieger
Reg. No. 42,768
Tel. No.: (360) 828-0589